

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of March 7, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-3, 9-13, 18-27, and 30-35 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Applicants have not amended the claims but provide a copy for the convenience of the Examiner.

Claims 1-3, 9, 18-27, 30-31, and 34-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *LaStrange et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,784,058, hereinafter *LaStrange*) in view of *Rivette et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,623,679, hereinafter *Rivette*). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants' claim 1 recites, among other features,

displaying, in the user interface, a first frame, including a first document context, which is the subject of a single navigational focus, the single navigational focus being defined as including a single set of navigational controls in the user interface configured to control all contexts within a frame of the display when the contexts are the subject of the single navigational focus;

...

shifting the navigational focus to the second frame, including the second document context, the single set of navigational controls in the user interface configured to control the second document context in the second frame.

As explicitly admitted in the Action, *LaStrange* fails to teach "a single navigational focus, which calls for a single set of navigational controls in a user interface configured to control all contexts within a frame of the display when the contexts are the subject of the single navigational focus." (Action, page 3). To cure the deficiencies of *LaStrange*, the Action cites Figure 30 of *Rivette*.

Like *LaStrange*, *Rivette* at most displays individual sets of controls for individual windows. (*Rivette*, Figure 30). As stated in the Brief Description of the Drawings section, Figure 30 of *Rivette* "illustrates the present invention's simultaneous display of an equivalent window and an image window, as well as the display of a Patent Image Toolbox for operating upon images displayed within the image window." (Col. 7, lines 12-15). Further, Figure 30 is similarly described in the Detailed Description of the Invention section of *Rivette* to be limited to single, different controls for different windows. (Col. 34, lines 19-28, lines 39-67, and col. 35, lines 14-25). Again, like *LaStrange*, though the equivalent window 160 and the image window 410 windows are simultaneously displayed, they are not subject to a single navigational focus. Instead,

each window is provided with its own independent set of navigational controls, creating a traditional multi-navigational focus architecture. Specifically, as described in the above noted portions and Figure 30 of *Rivette*, separate scroll bar functions exist for each window and the Patent Image Toolbox 430 is confined to operate upon images in image window 410. As such, *Rivette* fails to cure the deficiencies of *LaStrange* to teach or suggest a single navigational focus as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejection of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-3 and 30-31, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

To the extent that amended independent claims 9, 18, 19, and 20 are similar to claim 1 in the distinguishing respects set forth with respect to claim 1 and for the additional advantageous features recited therein, claims 9, 18, 19, and 20 are patentably distinct from the combination of *LaStrange* and *Rivette*. Claims 9, 18, 19, and 20 are thus allowable for similar reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Dependent claims 21-27 and 34-35 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20, as well as based on the additional features recited therein. For example, with respect to claim 24, *LaStrange* fails to teach or suggest "displaying, in the user interface, the second frame, including a document comprising at least one command in response to a command document display signal input by a user." The Office Action cites *LaStrange*, col. 5, lines 33-36 as describing this feature. However, this portion of *LaStrange* merely indicates that each window in the multi-window navigational structure has a page pinning feature. This is not the same as displaying, in the user interface, the second frame, including a document comprising at least one command in response to a command document display signal input by a user as recited in claim 24. Indeed, *LaStrange* does not teach or suggest the use of a command document display signal.

With respect to claim 25, *LaStrange* does not teach or suggest that the page pinning signal is initiated automatically in response to the input of the command document display signal. Instead, *LaStrange* describes loading a web page by overriding the currently displayed web page, which is not the same as page pinning being automatically initiated in response to the input of the command document display signal as recited in claim 25.

With respect to claim 27, *LaStrange* does not teach or suggest selecting a region in the first document context in which a command is to be performed.

Claims 10-13 and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *LaStrange* in view of *Rivette* and further in view of Fagioli (U.S. Pat. No. 6,710,790, hereinafter *Fagioli*). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above with reference to Applicants' claim 1, the combination of *LaStrange* and *Rivette* fails to teach or suggest a single navigational focus, which is similarly found in Applicants' claims 10-13 and 32-33. *Fagioli* fails to cure the deficiencies of *LaStrange* and *Rivette*. Thus, the claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1 and further in view of the novel features therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3000.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 6th day of June, 2006

By: /John M. Fleming/
John M. Fleming, Registration No. 56,536

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001